

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 8 and 10-28 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-7 and 9 have been canceled. Claim 8 has been amended. Claims 10-28 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

II. New Claims

New claims 10-26 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits that the addition of these new claims does not add new matter. Support for the new claims can be found at least at pages 36-42 of the detailed description; corresponding Figures 18-27; and in the original claims as filed.

Referring now to the independent claims added by this amendment, new claim 14 is directed toward a method of monitoring appropriateness of digital content. At least at page 36, lines 27-33, running a client based application on an electronic device connected to a network and sending an authentication signal from the client application to a server application running on at least one server are discussed. At least at page 36, lines 27-33, receiving configuration settings from the server application, wherein the server application only sends the configuration settings if the authentication signal indicates that a user of the electronic device is a valid user is discussed. At least at page 37, lines 5-6, configuring the client application based on the configuration settings is discussed. At least at page 37, lines 28-34 capturing in real time all requests for data; sending information based on the requests for data to the server application; receiving an approval or disapproval indication from the server application in response to the information; filtering in real time the digital data incoming from the network; and blocking the digital data if the information is a disapproval indication are discussed.

New claim 19 is directed toward an internet-protection method. In addition to at least some of the areas of the specification mentioned above, discussion of various features of claim 19 can be found at least at page 41, lines 15-21.

New claim 23 is directed toward a service-delivery method. In addition to at least some of the areas of the specification mentioned above, various features of claim 23 are discussed at

least at page 37 line 30 through page 38 line 28. Various features of claim 23 are also discussed at least at page 40 lines 13-26.

III. Claim Objections

Claims 1-3, 5, and 9 have been objected to for informalities. These claims have been canceled, rendering the objections moot.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1-7 and 9 have been canceled.

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,519,571 to Guheen et al. ("Guheen"), further in view of US Patent No. 5,911,043 to Duffy et al. ("Duffy"), and further in view of US Patent No. 6,321,267 to Albert L. Donaldson ("Donaldson"). Guheen discloses utilizing various types of user indicia such as search requests, products purchased and returned, reasons for returning products, customers' stated profile including income, and education level, stated profession for the purpose of customizing a user interface. Duffy is directed toward a system and method for computer-based rating of information retrieved from a computer network. Donaldson is directed toward a method and apparatus for filtering junk email. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8, as amended, distinguishes over the combination of Guheen, Duffy, and Donaldson.

Claim 8 is directed to a method of monitoring the appropriateness of digital content received at a plurality of monitored computers over a computer network, each of the plurality of monitored computers under the control of a monitored user. Feature (g) has been amended to now recite "for the plurality of monitored computers, utilizing the at least one communication application of the client application to automatically pass information related to the captured requests for data from the client application to the server in real time as the monitored user accesses the digital content." Additionally, feature (i) has been amended to now recite "utilizing the client application for blocking or permitting further communication in a predetermined manner in at least partial dependence on the approval or disapproval indication."

Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination fails to teach, suggest,

motivate, or render obvious at least these features of amended claim 8. None of the references, singularly or in combination, passes information from a client application to a server application related to captured requests for data and then blocks or permits further communication in a predetermined manner in at least partial dependence on the approval or disapproval indication as claimed in claim 8. Rather, at most, the cited combination first retrieves a document from a network and then rates the contents of the document before deciding whether to block the document.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, motivate, or render obvious claim 8. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application to be in condition for allowance. A Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Dated: December 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic Signature: /Jeffrey A. Tinker/

Jeffrey A. Tinker

Registration No.: 58,807

WINSTEAD PC

P.O. Box 50784

Dallas, Texas 75201

(214) 745-5400

Attorneys For Applicant